

REMARKS

Claims 37-45 and 49-52 are pending in the application. Claims 46-48 have been canceled. Claims 37-45, and 49-52 have been amended. Claims 39, 41, 44, and 50-52 have been amended to correct inconsistencies in the phrasing of their respective preambles and not for reasons related to patentability. The specification and abstract have been amended to incorporate the more common plural spelling of "die." Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original and other claims in this and any other application.

Claims 37-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e) as being anticipated by Fenner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,548,826 ("Fenner"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 37 recites a "method of testing a plurality of dies fabricated on a wafer." The method comprises, *inter alia*, "connecting a first terminal of each of said plurality of dies to a common signal conductor; connecting a second terminal of each of said plurality of dies to the first terminal on each respective die through a diode which allows said second terminal to receive a signal from said common signal conductor during a first test procedure; and reverse biasing the diode on at least some of said dies during a second test procedure to isolate said second terminal of said at least some of said dies from said common signal conductor during said second test procedure."

Fenner, by contrast, teaches placing a diode 210 between a terminal 206 on a die and a common signal conductor 202 not on the die. (Fenner Figure 4) Fenner does not teach or suggest "connecting a second terminal of each of said plurality of dies to the first terminal on each respective die through a diode which allows said second terminal to receive a signal from said common signal conductor during a first test procedure...." For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 37 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 40, and 42-44 depend from claim 37 and are allowable for at least the reason stated above with respect to claim 37 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejections of claims 40, and 42-44 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Independent claims 38 and 45 recite similar limitations as claim 37 and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 37 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejection of claims 38 and 45 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 39 and 41 depend from claim 38 and are allowable for at least the reason stated above with respect to claim 38 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejections of claims 39 and 41 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 49-52 depend from claim 45 and are allowable for at least the reason stated above with respect to claim 45 and on their own merits. Therefore, the rejections of claims 49-52 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200
Attorney for Applicant